DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 304 FL 023 700

AUTHOR Anstrom, Kris
TITLE New Directions for Chapter 1/Title 1.
INSTITUTION National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 95
CONTRACT T292008001
NOTE 14p.; For other issues in this series, see FL 023 694-701.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)
JOURNAL CIT Directions in Language and Education; v1 n7 Fall 1995

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Environment; *Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Ethnic Groups; *Federal Legislation; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; National Programs; School Restructuring; Second Language Learning; Special Needs Students
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the results and impact of Title I and Chapter I reforms. In 1992-93, elementary and secondary students (n=6,403,054) participated in Chapter I in the United States; 17 percent of this population was limited English proficient (LEP). Although the program has helped many, educators and researchers have questioned the effectiveness of these programs in addressing the educational needs of disadvantaged students. This concern led to the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, reform of Title I legislation, and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Title I mandated that States demonstrate challenging content and performance standards in math and reading or language arts because the basics-driven curriculum was no longer sufficient. Current reform has included curricular and instruction reform because Chapter I students were missing out on core academic instruction due to concentration on these subjects in pull-out programs. Use of in-class and extended time instruction has risen or been suggested, respectively, with the new reforms. Chapter 1 reforms also initiated increases in school-wide projects, greater inclusion of LEP students, and more teacher specialty training as well as greater flexibility and freedom at the school-level to design and implement these programs. Accountability and assessment have also been affected, and greater emphasis is now placed on school-parent-community partnerships. (Contains 12 references.) (NAV)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 394 304

# Directions in Language & Education

Vol. 1 No.7 Fall 1995

## New Directions for Chapter 1/Title I

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Gomez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL 023790



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions
IN LANGUAGE & EDUCATION

Vol. 1, No. 7, Fall 1995

## NEW DIRECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 1/TITLE I

by Kris Anstrom, NCBE Information Analyst

### OVERVIEW OF CHAPTER 1

In 1965, Title I was enacted "to provide financial assistance to local education agencies servicing areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their education programs by various means" (Public Law 89-10). From the beginning, Title I, which was replaced by Chapter 1 in 1981, was viewed as the vehicle for addressing the educational inequities of poor and educationally disadvantaged children.

Currently Chapter 1 participants represent a significant portion of the public and non-public school enrollment. Of the 48,110,000 elementary and secondary students enrolled in U.S. schools during the 1992-93 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994), 6,403,054 participated in Chapter 1 programs. This figure represents an increase of approximately 8 percent over the 1991-92 level of 5,903,619 students. Twenty-seven percent of Chapter 1 students were black, 29 percent were Hispanic, and 39 percent were white. Fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported that 17 percent of their Chapter 1 participants were limited English proficient (Sinclair & Gutmann, 1994).

FL023700

Chapter 1 programs are found in all 50 states, six territories, the District of Columbia, and Bureau of Indian Affairs' schools. The three states with the largest numbers of Chapter 1 students are California (1,383,287), Texas (584,603), and New York (460,025). Texas and California also received the largest number of Chapter 1 Basic Grants to local education agencies (LEAs), 1031 and 1002 respectively, followed by Illinois with 861 grants and New York with 714 (Sinclair & Gutmann, 1994).

## IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT: NEW DIRECTIONS FOR TITLE I

Over its 30 year history, Chapter 1 has represented the Federal government's commitment to educating poor and educationally disadvantaged students. This commitment has brought about much-needed reforms including improved accountability for the performance of disadvantaged students and an increase in the basic skills performance of these students. Furthermore, Chapter 1 acknowledged the significant impact of parental participation on successful education programs. However, educators, researchers and others involved with Chapter 1 (now Title I) programs have raised concerns about the effectiveness of these programs in addressing the educational needs of disadvantaged students (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act, which was enacted into law as The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA), became the vehicle for addressing these concerns and has led to the reform of Title I legislation.

The new Title I legislation aims to provide the means for children in high-poverty schools to meet the new academic, content, and performance standards that are required for all children and that states will be developing as part of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. A summary of the legislation released by the Department of Education in October of 1994 makes clear the principles Title I will adhere to in this reform initiative. These include aligning all components of the education system so that Title I students have the opportunity to achieve high standards; concentration on curricular and instructional reform with a renewed emphasis on effective teaching and learning principles; more flexibility and localized decision making; requiring that accountability be tied to state standards and assessments; and new partnerships between schools, parents and communities (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). Each of these principles challenges the status quo; thus, each needs to be viewed in the context of what Chapter 1 has been in order to understand the deep-seeded changes that will need to occur.

## ACHIEVING HIGH STANDARDS

The new Title I legislation requires states receiving Title I funds to demonstrate that they have challenging content and performance standards in at least the areas of math and reading or language arts and that these standards are used to uphold Title I programs and students to the same high standards expected of all students (IASA, sec. 1111, 1994).

From its inception, Chapter 1 has emphasized remedial instruction in reading and math. Originally, it was intended to supplement, not supplant, general education programs. This, in part, led to the development of a curriculum that emphasized basic skills development since the predominant philosophy of that time was that students needed to acquire the basics before they could progress to a more academically challenging curriculum (Burnett, Flaxman & Ascher, 1994). Basic skills instruction continues to predominate in Chapter 1 programs; in the 1991-92 school year, 84 percent of elementary school teachers reported that basic skills drill and practice was the major focus of reading instruction. Only 29 percent said developing higher order thinking skills was the major focus (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). The preponderance of a basics-driven curricula is based on the assumption that disadvantaged children have deficits that can only be addressed through what has come to be known as the "deficit model." This deficit model has influenced not only Chapter 1 reading but also Chapter 1 math. Mathematics classes have overemphasized the ability to derive a "right answer" rather than "an understanding of the ways that those answers are derived, the ways they are related to one another, or the ways that they might be applied in other situations" (Burnett, Flaxman & Ascher, 1994).

However, the new Title I makes clear that a basics-driven curriculum is no longer sufficient. Components of a targeted assistance school program (schools that are ineligible or have not opted for a schoolwide approach), should "use effective instructional strategies...that help provide an accelerated, high quality curriculum, including applied learning; and...coordinate with and support the regular education program (IASA, sec. 1115, 1994). Therefore, if disadvantaged children are to meet the high performance standards demanded of all students, Title I programs will need to focus on developing students' cognitive strategies, emphasizing meaning and understanding, rather than the often decontextualized drill-and-practice in basic facts and skills, contextualizing instruction in "real texts" and real-life problems, integrating reading, writing and language arts, and seeking connections between content areas and between school and home life (Knapp et al., 1993).

## CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL REFORM

### Pullout Programs

Curricular fragmentation resulting from Chapter 1 students missing out on core academic instruction while attending remedial reading and math classes has been a frequently occurring side effect of Chapter 1 programs (Passow, 1988). Furthermore, time spent in instruction is limited—generally 30 minutes per day—and does not add much instructional time since time is taken away from other instructional activities—most frequently regular reading/language arts. Overall, the majority of Chapter 1 pullout programs add only 10 minutes of additional instruction time each day. Though pullout models have been criticized widely in the literature on Chapter 1 programming, they continue to be widely used. During the 1991-92 school year, 74 percent of elementary schools offered at least some form of pullout instruction as part of their Chapter 1 programming (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993).

Partly due to the criticism of pullout programs, the use of in-class instruction has risen since 1985-86. During the 1985-86 school year only 28 percent of schools used this type of programming; by the 1991-92 school year, 58 percent of schools reported offering some form of in-class instruction. Unfortunately, this movement toward greater "inclusion" in the mainstream classroom has not necessarily overcome the problems associated with pullout programs. Students are often segregated within the classroom and receive the same basic skills instruction and rote drilling as in many pullout programs (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). The new legislation reforms target assistance programs by requiring that these programs "give primary consideration to extended time strategies, be based on what research shows is most effective in teaching and learning, and involve accelerated curricula, effective instructional strategies, strong coordination with the regular program, and highly qualified and trained staff" (U.S. Department of Education, 1994).

### Extended-Time Programs

Programs that rely on extended learning time, also known as add-on programs, have not been widely used. Before- and after-school instruction was used by 9 percent of elementary schools, and only 15 percent offered summer school instruction during the 1991-92 school year (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). Though add-on programs do not take time away from other instruction and do add additional time spent on-task, an important factor in the achievement of disadvantaged students, they do not necessarily lead to achievement gains.

As with the aforementioned programs, additional instructional t[illegible]annot be wasted on meaningless rote learning tasks and must include challen[illegible]ricula, individualized instruction and raised expectations (Burnett, Flaxman & Ascher, 1994). With emphasis in the new legislation given to extended-time strategies for targeted assistance schools, the challenge will be to develop curricula which emphasize higher order skills within a context that is meaningful to the students and which relates to the general education program.

## Schoolwide Projects

Though intended to encourage fundamental instructional reforms, such as integration of curricula and services, case studies of schoolwide projects have indicated that reduction in class size, a decrease or elimination in the number of pullout programs, more staff development time and widespread use of Chapter 1 materials by all students have commonly been the results of adopting a schoolwide project. Schoolwide projects were first authorized in 1978 amendments to Title I. Since 1988, the number of schools implementing this model has increased from approximately 200 in the 1988-89 year to more than 2000 for the 91-92 school year. Prior to the recent reauthorization of the ESEA, only schools with poverty rates of at least 75 percent were eligible for schoolwide projects (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). The new legislation recognizes that Title I can become the catalyst for reforming the entire instructional program by lowering the minimum poverty level for eligibility to 60 percent for the 1995-96 school year and then to 50 percent in subsequent years (IASA, sec. 1114, 1994).

With the increased attention and funding given to schoolwide projects, it is imperative to understand the challenges and obstacles confronting schools that implement these projects. Transitioning to a schoolwide project implies that new approaches, roles, and administrative structures will need to be learned. Adequate time and preparation for the transition are crucial as is ongoing staff development in new technologies, new standards-based content and methods, and more effective teaching styles. Equally important are the alliances that will need to be formed with parents, community based organizations, and businesses. Such alliances are essential in giving the assistance schools need to encourage academic achievement in their students. An additional issue for schoolwide projects is to find ways to stabilize change once the project has been successfully implemented given the propensity for administrative turnover in high poverty schools (Policy Studies Associates, 1994).

### Secondary Students

Currently, only four percent of students receiving Chapter 1 services are in grades 10-12 (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). To ensure that Title I serves more secondary students, the new legislation specifies that LEAs must serve high-poverty middle and high schools before serving other elementary schools that fall below the 75 percent poverty level (IASA, sec. 1113, 1994). In addition to instructional services, Title I resources can also be used for career and college guidance, counseling and mentoring, and other services that help transition students to higher education or work (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). Challenges for secondary Title I programs include integrating academics with practical training and coordinating services with other programs for at-risk youth, such as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Tech-Prep, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (IASA, sec. 1114, 1994).

### Limited English Proficient Students

The previous Chapter 1 law required that programs distinguish between educational deprivation and limited English proficiency when determining eligibility for programming (Section 1014 [d] [1]). The new legislation eliminates this requirement thus paving the way for greater inclusion of LEP students in Title I services. In addition, Title I requires that LEA plans describe how they will coordinate and integrate services with other education services, including those offered to LEP students (IASA, sec. 1112, 1994). The new Title I also specifies that assessments that determine the yearly performance of each school must "provide for the inclusion of limited English proficient students who shall be assessed, to the extent practicable in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what students know and can do, to determine such students' mastery of skills in subjects other than English" (IASA, sec. 1111, 1994). These new provisions raise additional challenges for Title I programming including determining appropriate native language assessments and/or designing alternative assessments that evaluate LEP students' academic knowledge and skills. In addition, educating Title I staff in methods and strategies for working with the LEP population will be critical if these students are to be effectively served through Title I programs.

### Professional Development

For the 1992-93 school year, 82,310 FTE teachers and 74,268 FTE teacher aides provided Chapter 1 services (Sinclair & Gutmann, 1994). The importance of well-trained and qualified staff cannot be understated, and most school principals rated the quality of

Chapter 1 teachers as being at least as high as the average classroom teacher, if not higher. However, Chapter 1 teachers are not the only personnel who provide instruction. In fact, in many classrooms teacher aides conduct as much of the instruction as the teachers, and usually are not as well-trained, frequently having only a high school diploma. Moreover, a recent survey indicated that Chapter 1 staff receive only minimal intensive staff development, and Chapter 1 elementary aides spent even less time in staff development than did Chapter 1 teachers. When staff development is offered, it is often of a piece meal nature, covering an array to topics that may or may not be related (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993).

The new Title I legislation focuses attention on this deficit by specifying that all personnel receive the high quality professional development needed to assist students to meet the new academic standards. In addition, the legislation provides direction for the type of professional development that should be given. It requires professional development activities that "support instructional practices that are geared to challenging State content standards and create a school environment conducive to high achievement in the academic subjects." Furthermore, it allows schools to combine resources from other sources such as Title II of IASA and Title III of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* and, "where appropriate...include strategies for developing curricula and teaching methods that integrate academic and vocational instruction (including applied learning and team teaching strategies)." In order for this integration and collaboration to occur, local education agencies are encouraged to design professional development programs that include all staff, not just Title I staff (IASA, sec. 1119, 1994).

## FLEXIBILITY AND LOCALIZED DECISION MAKING

Under the new legislation, schools, in consultation with their districts, will have greater freedom to design and implement Title I programs according to their particular needs. Ongoing planning will be an integral part of school programs and will be aligned with what teachers and students need rather than merely conforming to administrative procedures. In addition, waivers of statutory or regulatory provisions will be allowed when schools, districts, or states can prove that these provisions hinder their reform efforts (U.S. Department of Education, 1994).

## ACCOUNTABILITY AND ASSESSMENT

Formerly, Chapter 1 mandated the use of norm-referenced tests for aggregate reporting. Districts usually use norm referenced tests for several purposes: student eligibility and identification, instructional feedback and diagnosis, and local, state, and national accountability. Because norm-referenced testing has been extensively used for Chapter 1 accountability purposes, districts have tended to use the same test data for other purposes, rather than using more tests. Usage of the same test data for multiple purposes has led to a lack of data for teachers to determine parts of the curriculum with which students are having difficulty. The multiple choice format of tests has encouraged teaching to the test and detracted from the more important aim of making Chapter 1 instruction relevant and useful in a real-world sense (Burnett, Flaxman & Ascher, 1994).

The new legislation focuses on these issues by requiring that Title I assessment be aligned with state testing systems that are keyed to curriculum frameworks which, in turn, are based on performance standards for all students (IASA, sec. 1111, 1994). The challenge for Title I programs, then, will be to design assessments that continue strong emphasis on accountability but that are aligned closely with what is actually being taught and learned by the students. Title I assessment will need to move toward emphasizing advanced skills rather than the basic skills it has in the past, and will need to link testing to course content. In order to meet this challenge of retaining accountability and ensuring accurate information from which informed decision making can be made, multiple testing measures will need to be implemented which may include alternative methods of assessment (Reinforcing the Promise, Reforming the Paradigm, 1993). Indeed, the Title I legislation specifically states that assessments must "involve multiple up-to-date measures of student performance, including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding" (IASA, sec. 1111, 1994).

## SCHOOL-PARENT-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Since the enactment of the 1988 Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments, Chapter 1 schools have expanded their parental involvement activities. These amendments acknowledged the significant role parents have in their children's education and the methods by which schools can enlist parents as partners. Additionally, the inception of the Even Start program provided a way for education agencies to integrate early childhood education with family literacy training (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993).

Though Chapter 1 has emphasized the significant impact of parental participation on successful education programs and has created opportunities for parental involvement, research has indicated that many parents are still unsure about how to get involved in their children's education. One proposal for improving partnerships between schools and parents includes requiring parent-school contracts which would detail the shared responsibilities parents and schools have in educating children to meet high standards. Parents' responsibilities "include making sure that students come to school, that they are ready to learn, and that they do their homework." On their side, schools would need to "provide children with equitable access to learning opportunities and inform parents about their children's performance and about ways that parents can become involved in their children's education" (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993).

The new Title I legislation speaks to this need by requiring that local education agencies receiving parental involvement funds "jointly develop with parents... a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards." Furthermore, the legislation specifies that the compact will describe "ways in which each parent will be responsible for supporting their children's learning, such as monitoring attendance, homework completion, and television watching...." It also stipulates that parental involvement is to be ensured by various means including providing assistance in understanding assessments and in how to monitor a child's progress. Community-based organizations and businesses should also be included in parent involvement activities (IASA, sec. 1118, 1994).

Another issue for some Chapter 1 schools has been the lack of clear information concerning school performance and improvement. For example, some high-poverty schools may have overstated student performance by awarding As for certain work which in low-poverty schools would have earned Cs. Thus, parents of students attending high poverty schools may be misled into believing that the school's performance is satisfactory. What is needed, then, are reporting procedures that directly relate what parents and the community need to know about school quality (Reinventing Chapter 1, 1993). The new legislation does, in part, address this concern, by requiring that schools provide parents

school performance profiles and interpretations of their results (Improving America's Schools Act 1994, Title I, sec. 1118). The implementation of the legislation will determine how well parents are informed.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE TITLE I LEGISLATION

- Coordinates the State, local education agency, and schools' programs to ensure high standards for all children.
- Provides students with an accelerated curriculum and instruction that will allow them to meet the high standards.
- Emphasizes extended learning time and/or schoolwide programs that will allow Title I students to receive instruction at least equivalent to that received by other children.
- Promotes schoolwide reform, effective instructional methods, and challenging academic content.
- Enhances the quality of instruction by expanding professional development opportunities.
- Aligns services under all sections of Title I with each other, with other educational programs, and with health and social services, when feasible.
- Strengthens parent involvement in their children's education.
- Allocates resources to areas where the need is greatest.
- Uses State assessment systems to improve accountability and to demonstrate how well children are achieving the State's performance standards.
- Allows schools and teachers more authority in making decisions in return for greater responsibility for student performance (IASA, sec. 1001, 1994).

## REFERENCES

Burnett, G., Flaxman, E., and Ascher, C. (1994). *The unfulfilled mission of Title I/Chapter 1 programs.* New York: Teachers College, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Improving America's Schools Act, PL 103-382. (1994). Title I.

Knapp, M. S. et al. (1993). *Academic challenge for the children of poverty, volume 1: Findings and conclusions.* Menlo Park, CA/Washington, DC: SRI International/Policy Studies Associates.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). *Mini-digest of education statistics 1994.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Passow, A. H. (1988). *Curriculum and instruction in Chapter 1: A look back and a look ahead.* New York: Teachers College, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Policy Studies Associates. (1994). *An idea book: Implementing schoolwide projects.* Washington, DC: Author.

Puma, M. J., et al. (1993). *Prospects: The congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity—the interim report.* Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates, Inc.

Sinclair, B. and Gutmann, B. (1994). *State Chapter 1 participation and achievement information—1992-1993.* Westat, Inc.: Rockville, MD.

Stringfield, S. et al. (1994). *Special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: First year report.* Baltimore, MD/Cambridge, MA: The Johns Hopkins University/Abt Associates, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education. (1994). *The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994: Summary sheets.* Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *Reinforcing the promise, reforming the paradigm: Report of the Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1.* Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *Reinventing Chapter 1: The current Chapter 1 program and new directions: Final report of the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program.* Washington, DC: Author.

## Other Titles Available from NCBE

NCBE Focus Occasional Papers and Program Information Guides are available for $3.50 per copy. Full-text versions of NCBE publications are also available on NCBE's gopher at: **gopher.ncbe.gwu.edu**

### Focus Occasional Paper Series

12. **Mentoring bilingual teachers.** M. E. Torres-Guzmán & L. A. Goodwin, 1995.
11. **Implementing bilingual programs is everybody's business.** T. Griego-Jones, 1995.
10. **For all students: Limited English proficient students and Goals 2000.** D. August, with K. Hakuta & D. Pompa, 1994.
9. **Bilingual education: A look to the year 2000.** G. N. García, 1994.
8. **Distance learning: The challenge for a multicultural society.** A. Barrera, 1993.
7. **School readiness and language minority students: Implications of the first National Education Goal.** C. D. Prince & L. A. Lawrence, 1993.
6. **Re-thinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools.** R. Milk, C. Mercado & A. Sapiens, 1992.
5. **Programs for secondary LEP students: A California study.** C. Minicucci & L. Olsen, 1992.

### Program Information Guide Series

24. **TeamWorks: Mainstream and bilingual/ESL teacher collaboration.** K. Sakash & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown, 1995.
23. **Linguistic diversity and reform: Can the practices be identified?** A. Nadeau, forthcoming.
22. **Assessing language development in bilingual preschool children.** B. McLaughlin et al., 1995.
21. **Integrating Title I and Title VII: The evolving model of Dearborn Public Schools, Michigan.** S. Arraf et al., 1995.
20. **Reconstructing the bilingual special education interface.** L. Baca & J. S. de Valenzuela, 1994.
19. **Working with English language learners: Strategies for elementary and middle schools.** A. M. Zehler, 1994.
18. **Whole-school bilingual education programs: Implications for sound assessment.** A. Del Vecchio et al., 1994.
17. **Family literacy for language minority families: Issues for program implementation.** M. Mulhern et al., 1994.
16. **Multicultural education: Strategies for linguistically diverse schools and classrooms.** D. Menkart, 1993.
15. **Reforming mathematics instruction for ESL literacy students.** K. Buchanan & M. Helman, 1993.
14. **Applying elements of effective secondary schooling for language minority students: A tool for reflection and stimulus to change.** T. Lucas, 1993.
13. **The Literacy Club: A cross-age tutoring/paired reading project.** B. Cook & C. Urzúa, 1993.
12. **Cooperative learning in the secondary school: Maximizing language acquisition, academic achievement, and social development.** D. D. Holt et al., 1992.
11. **Teaching science to English learners, grades 4-8.** A. K. Fathman et al., 1992.
10. **Writer's Workshop and children acquiring English as a non-native Language.** K. Davies Samway, 1992.
9. **Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students.** L. Valdez Pierce & J. M. O'Malley, 1992.

**The Directions in Language & Education series is published by the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. This and other monograph series published by NCBE are not copyrighted; readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards.**

**The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T292008001 by The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Center for Policy Studies. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. government.**

The George Washington University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE